

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 11-24 are pending in the present application.
Claims 1 and 17 are independent claims.

Corrected Formal Drawings

Attached hereto are two (2) replacement sheets of drawings depicting corrected formal Figs. 1-3A. These sheets replace the original filed corresponding sheets of drawings. The drawings changes made to these replacement sheets were already approved by the Examiner in response to the Drawing Change Approval Request filed on April 3, 2003.

35 U.S.C. § 103 REJECTION

Claim 1-3, 8, 11-13, 15-21 and 23-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed background art¹ and in view of Farrell et al. (or "Farrell" - U.S. Patent No. 5,247,675). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 17, the Examiner basically maintains the previous rejection over the combination of Applicant's disclosed

¹ It is uncertain whether Applicant's disclosed background art qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Nevertheless, Applicant will address the rejection(s) assuming that it is for the sake of the argument.

background art and Farrell. In the previous Response filed on April 3, 2003, Applicant argued that it is improper to equate Farrell's run list to Applicant's waiting-list of the *event* because Farrell's run list queues therein only those threads with the highest priority from each dispatch class. In contrast, Applicant's waiting-list of the event stores therein all the tasks (and not just the highest priority tasks) when no event is provided to the tasks.

In the final Office Action dated May 22, 2003 (page 6, lines 4-7), the Examiner states that this argument is not persuasive because "in order to run, the run list queues only the highest priority order tasks of all the tasks from each dispatch class; but it stores all the tasks (each dispatch class (DCD) [and] also identifies high and low pointers which point to the highest and lowest priority threads with the dispatch class." However, Farrell's run list *does not* store or queue all the tasks from each dispatch class. Farrell, including the specific portions cited by the Examiner, nowhere discloses that its run list queues all the tasks from each dispatch class. Farrell clearly emphasizes that only the highest priority thread from each dispatch class is queued on the run list 32 for execution (e.g., see column 4, lines 40-42; Abstract).

When a Thread Create function 15 is called to create each thread in Farrell, a thread having the structure as shown in Fig. 2 is created and stored in the system. This structure identifies the priority level of the task. However, the run list 32 does not store all the threads created and stored in the system,

but only stores the highest priority thread from each dispatch class. As such, Farrell nowhere discloses inserting each of the tasks into a waiting-list of the event in priority order when no event is provided to the tasks, as in Applicant's claimed invention. In fact, Farrell does not disclose "a waiting-list of the event" and Farrell's run list for storing only the highest priority tasks cannot be equated to Applicant's waiting-list of the event.

Thus, even if the references are combinable, assuming *arguendo*, the combination of references would still fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*:

inserting said each of the tasks into a waiting-list of the event in priority order when no event is provided to the tasks,

wherein in the case that the event transfer occurs, the task having the highest priority in the waiting-list obtains the event, is woken up and is resumed with execution

as recited in independent claim 1;

inserting said each of the tasks into a waiting-list of the event according to a priority order when no event is provided to the tasks

as recited in independent claim 17.

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 17 and their dependent claims (due to their dependency) are patentable over the applied references, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 7, 14 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's disclosed background art in view of Farrell

et al. and further in view of Salpaugh (U.S. Patent No. 5,734,903). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, the combination of Applicant's background art and Farrell fails to teach or suggest at least the above-noted features recited in independent claims 1 and 17 from which claims 6, 7, 14 and 22 depend. Salpaugh does not overcome these deficiencies since Salpaugh is directed to generating a message ID and has nothing to do with inserting each of the tasks into a waiting-list of the event in priority order when no event is provided to the tasks, in an event transfer environment.

Thus, even if the references are combinable, assuming *arguendo*, independent claims 1 and 17 and their dependent claims (due to their dependency) are patentable over the applied references, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Official Interview Request

Applicant(s) hereby requests officially a personal interview with the Examiner to further discuss the rejections of record. Please contact Applicant's representative, Esther H. Chong (Registration No. 40,953), at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to schedule the interview prior to an issuance of another action on this case.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all of the rejections of record, and earnestly solicits an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.


The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Response After Final Rejection in that it reduces the issues for appeal.


Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Esther H. Chong (Registration No. 40,953) at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Joseph A. Kolasch, #22,463
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22032-0747
(703) 205-8000


JAK/EHC:lmh/bsh
Attachment: Two (2) replacement sheets
depicting Figs. 1-3A